

¿cómo se pre-
disaba en el
mundo II, ¿por
qué no hay?

A
P
U
N
T
E
S

God has given to us, I know well, the liberty of use, but only so far as necessary; and He has determined that the use should be common. And it is monstrous for one to live in luxury, while many are in want. How much more glorious is it to die than to live in luxury.

Miguel
7
Banderas

An Evangelical Call to a Social Spirituality: Confronting Evil in Urban Society!

Eldin Villafañe

San Tom
plor y
obispo
y las
marjinas
tambien

much much wiser to spend money on human beings, than on jewels and gold! How much more useful to acquire decorous friends, than lifeless ornaments! Whom have lands ever benefited so much as conferring favours has? It remains for us, therefore, to do away with this allegation: Who, then, will have the more sumptuous things, if all select the simpler? Men, I would say, if they make use of them impartially and indifferently.

Artificial Intelligence, 1992, and Las Casas: The Valladolid Connection

Alejandro García Rivera

restraint, yet, with a view to the use of what is necessary, we must seek after what can be most easily procured, bidding a long farewell to these superfluities.

In fine, they must accordingly utterly cast off ornaments as girls' gewgaws, rejecting adornment itself entirely. For they ought to be adorned within, and show the inner woman beautiful. For in the soul alone are beauty and deformity shown. Wherefore also only the virtuous man is really beautiful and good. And it is laid down as a dogma, that only the beautiful is good. And excellence alone appears through the beautiful body, and blossoms out in the flesh, exhibiting the amiable comeliness of self-control, whenever the character like a beam of light gleams in the form. For the beauty of each plant and animal consists in its individual excellence. And the excellence of man is righteousness, and temperance, and manliness, and godliness. The beautiful man is, then, he who is just, temperate, and in a word, good, not he who is rich. But now even the soldiers wish to be

Reseña bibliográfica

Pedro Sandín Fremant

Apuntes bibliográficos

Reflexiones
teológicas
desde
el
margen
hispano

¿el Antiguo?

old, not having read that poetical saying:

"With childish folly to the war he came,

Laden with store of gold."

But the love of ornament, which is far from caring for but claims the body for itself, when the love of the beautiful has changed to empty show, is to be utterly expelled.

¹ *Ibid.*, ii. 872.

graduate Theological Union

JUN 26 1991

Year 11, No. 2, Summer, 1991
Año 11, No. 2, Verano, 1991

PRESENTACION

El primer artículo en este número es del **Dr. Eldin Villafañe**, ministro ordenado de las Asambleas de Dios y Decano para Asuntos Urbanos en el Seminario Teológico Gordon Conwell.

El segundo artículo es del **Rev. Alejandro García Rivera**, ingeniero, ministro ordenado de la Iglesia Evangélica Luterana de América y estudiante doctoral en la Escuela Luterana de Teología en Chicago.

La reseña bibliográfica es del **Dr. Pedro Sandín Fremaint**, quien se desempeña como Director del Departamento de Estudios Interdisciplinarios de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Apuntes (ISSN # 0279-9790) is published quarterly by the Mexican American Program, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX 75275. Second class postage paid at Dallas, TX 75260 and additional mailing offices. Subscription is \$5.00 per year.

POSTMASTER, send address changes to: Apuntes, Mexican American Program, Perkins School of Theology, Southern University, Dallas, TX 75275.

Manuscripts are to be sent to our editorial offices: Apuntes, Justo L. González, Editor, 336 Columbia Dr., Decatur, GA 30030.

Mailing and printing of **Apuntes** are provided by the United Methodist Publishing House.

An Evangelical Call to a Social Spirituality: Confronting Evil in Urban Society

Eldin Villafañe

As we enter the 21st century, there is no greater need for evangelicals in the cities than to articulate, both in word and deed, a social spirituality. The twin phenomenon of urbanization and globalization, which defines the ethos of our great cities, demand no more and no less than an authentically biblical and evangelical spirituality. If the Whole Church is to take the Whole Gospel to the Whole World, it must have a "Wholistic" spirituality.

A spirituality, if it is to be authentic and relevant, should correlate with all of life; for after all the Spirit of the Lord, who leads and empowers, must lead and empower all areas of our life. spirituality has been defined as "a particular style of approach to union with God,"¹ "a following of Jesus,"² "a style of living the life of the Holy Spirit,"³ or my own personal definition, which synthesizes a trinitarian and moral thrust, "in obedience to God, the following of Jesus in the power of the Spirit." Undergirding these various definitions is a self-understanding of a loving heart yearning, seeking and responding as a whole person, in the obedience of faith, to a loving God.

The history of the spiritualities of the church reflects the spiritual pilgrimage of particular individuals and of particular people, at a particular time and in a particular context. The times we live, the cities we live in, and the Gospel we live by, call us to a spirituality that goes beyond, though yet includes, "a personal transfiguration into the image of Christ."⁴

One can surely make a case for the emergence at distinct periods throughout the church (both Catholic and Protestant) of what can be termed a Wholistic spirituality --covering "the following of Jesus" in *both* personal transformation/piety and social transformation/piety. Yet by and large our contemporary evangelical spirituality has been defined only by the individualistic and personal dimension. This personal transformation into the image of Christ, by grace, through faith, by means of the Word, prayer, contemplation and the exercise of the "spiritual disciplines," is thus inner-directed and vertical. The missing dimension of social transformation/piety (which includes social witness, social service and social action, thus, outer-directed and horizontal), as "bona fide" spirituality, has been excluded from an authentically biblical and evangelical definition of spirituality. The call is

1. George A. Lane, *Christian Spirituality: An Historical Sketch* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1984), p. 2.

2. Gustavo Gutiérrez, *We Drink from our Own Wells: The Spiritual Journey of a People* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1984), p. 1.

3. Frances X. Meehan, *A Contemporary Social Spirituality* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1982), p. 1.

4. Donald G. Bloesch, *The Struggle of Prayer* (Colorado Springs, Colorado: Helmers & Howard, 1988), p. 3.

to redefine and re-appropriate from Scripture and from the rich heritage of the church, a social spirituality that is consistent with the "following of Jesus."

Jesus Christ, the Anointed One (Lk 4:18; Ac 10:38), is the paradigm *par excellence* of this spirituality. Through *the power of the Spirit* the believer is *both*, and I quote "being transformed into his likeness with ever-increasing glory, which comes from the Lord, who is the Spirit" (2 Co 3:18); *and* challenged to follow Him, and I quote, "as the Father has sent me, I am sending you . . . receive the Holy Spirit" (Jn 20:21-22). Thus, the double focus and goal of Christian spirituality has: 1) a vertical focus --the continual transformation into the likeness of Jesus, the resurrected Lord; and 2) a horizontal focus --the following of Jesus, in similar obedience of the Father's missional calling (Lk 4:18-19). Both of these foci and goals can only be carried out in the power of the Spirit, and undergirded by God's love. Both have a vertical and horizontal dimension that interrelates them and dynamically "nourishes" them. "Transformation" needs "following" and "following" needs "transformation." Both have a personal and social dimension that equally interrelates them and dynamically "nourishes" them.

The "vertical-transformation" focus and its interrelationship with the horizontal is noted well in 1 Jn 4:7-13 (NIV):

. . . let us love one another, for love comes from God. Everyone who loves has been born of God and knows God. Whoever does not love does not know God, because God is love. This is how God showed his love among us: He sent his one and only Son into the world that we might live through him. This is love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son as an atoning sacrifice for our sins. . . Since God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. No one has ever seen God; but if we love each other, God lives in us and his love is made complete in us. We know that we live in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit.

The "horizontal-following" focus and its interrelationship with the vertical is noted well by Jesus' missional self-understanding (which should also be ours) in Lk 4:18-19 (NIV):

The Spirit of the Lord is on me; therefore he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.

This dynamic and dialectical spirituality is to be "worked out" in a social context. A social context that deeply needs both contemplative and apostolic activity. The brokenness of society (so visible in the *barrios* and ghettos of our cities), the scriptural missional mandate, and the Spirit's love constrains us to feed the hungry, visit the sick and prisoners, shelter the homeless and poor --to express God's love in social concerns. We do this as an expression of faithful obedience and authentic spirituality.

In the later part of this century, through the careful reading and re-reading of Scripture (especially from the context of the "periphery") and the critical utilization of the analytical tools of the social sciences, we have gained a new understanding of our social reality. The concomitant Pentecostal/Charismatic outpouring of the

Spirit, also in this century, has brought to many a critical awareness and discernment of the depth and complexity of sin --the "mystery of iniquity."

There is a need to extend the evangelicals' classical understanding of spirituality's struggles with the flesh, the world, and the devil with their *social correlates*, namely --sinful social structures, the "world" (*kosmos*), and "principalities and powers." The Evangelical Church is thus challenged to acknowledge that an authentic and relevant spirituality must be wholistic, responding to both the vertical and horizontal dimension of life. The inclusion of the social dimension in a *redefinition* of spirituality is the missing ingredient of contemporary evangelical spirituality.

Let me move now to consider elements contributing to a social spirituality. These elements will be presented under four major headings: 1) The Spirit's "Grieving" - Sin: Personal and Social; 2) Mystery of Iniquity: The Texture of Social Existence; 3) The Gospel of the Reign of God; and 4) The Challenge to Confront Structural Sin and Evil.

The Spirit's "Grieving" - Sin: Personal and Social⁵

The spiritual pilgrimage of the believer is a pilgrimage of love. Any true spirituality is ultimately the loving of God and the neighbor as oneself (Mt 19:19) --the integration of the spiritual and the ethical, of worship and service, and of identity and vocation. Love is often easier to acknowledge than to define. What Augustine said of "time" can probably be said of love: "If no one asks me, I know, if I wish to explain it to one that asketh, I know not."⁶ In any description love is deeply personal. The love of God in Christ poured out by the Holy Spirit establishes a loving relationship with God that, as with all love affairs, particularly the human response, is subject to the vacillations, void, and vicissitudes of life.

As mere humans in a spiritual pilgrimage of love, we aggrieve the object of our love often. Whether the grieving of that object of love be human or divine (in our immediate understanding of the object), it is ultimately a grieving of the Spirit. The "love of the Spirit" (Ro 15:30) can be grieved.

A careful exegesis of Paul's admonition in Eph 4:5 places the context of the grieving of the Spirit within an ethico-spiritual relationship with others. These attitudes and actions of the believers that "cut" the relationship of love and thus grieve the Holy Spirit are called sin in Scripture. In the biblical revelation sin can be more broadly described as: *disobedience* to the Lordship of God, *injustice* and *alienation*, and *unbelief* and *idolatry*.⁷ We sin, thus the Spirit is grieved, when we do not imitate God, sacrificially give up ourselves as Christ, and "live a life of love." (Eph 4:30; 5:1-2).

5. See, Eph 4:30; 5:1-2 (NIV).

6. Augustine, *Confessions*, Bk. II (New York: Random House, 1949), p. 253, quoted in Meehan, *Op. Cit.*, p. 1.

7. See, Orlando Costas, *Christ Outside the Gate: Mission Beyond Christendom* (New York: Orbis Books, 1982), pp. 21-24; cf., Walter Grundmann: *hamartía*, Gerhard Kittel, editor, trans., Geoffrey W. Bromiley, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Volume I (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 267-316.

The Apostle Paul clearly teaches that sin is a harsh taskmaster, "for the wages of sin is death" (Ro 6:23a). The predicament of *all* persons is death --separation from God, from others, from themselves, and even from creation. Scripture is quite clear that individual action has marked social implications. It likewise notes that social or corporate action has marked individual implications.⁸ Sin, while being deeply personal, is not just individualistic. The person as a *socius* ("person-in-community") is vividly portrayed by Paul's anthropological understanding of "corporate personality" as noted in Ro 5:12: "just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned." Orlando Costas notes, commenting on this verse, that:

The sin of one man affected all, because "all" were represented already in the one. Therefore guilt and condemnation have passed to all. All are guilty of sin, not just because they personally sin, but because they are part of Adam. Thus sin is both personal and social.⁹

Sin and its work is a reality in all human experience. No area of personal and human history is left untouched by its destructive reality. It is ultimately and radically death/separation from God.

The response to sin and death is the need for the loving initiative of the Spirit of God to convict of sin, righteousness, and judgement (Jn 16: 8-11), based on the equally radical answer of "The Crucified God."¹⁰ Paul speaks eloquently of the multifaceted drama of redemption that deals with sin and death:

But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved), and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus (Eph 2:4-6, KJV).

The power of sin and death is broken. In the Cross of Christ the believer has the resources to overcome its dominion. My colleague David F. Wells notes that "the world, the flesh and the devil are not invincible competitors but doomed adversaries. In the work on the Cross, Christ conquered them, and through the work of the Spirit, that conquest is brought into our modern world."¹¹

It grieves the Spirit when believers manifest the works of sin. Paul in his letter to the Galatians chapter five notes that sin's work in human nature (*sarx*, "the

8. In Scripture there are many cases (i.e., Jos 7; Ro 5:12-21) that illustrate this truth of the interrelatedness of human personality in the web of other persons and actions. For the Hebrew conception of this "corporate personality" see, H. Wheeler Robinson, *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964).

9. Costas, *Op. Cit.*, p. 25. Both Paul and Costas implicitly underline in this passage not just the universality of sin but equally its manifestation in corporate personality.

10. See, Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

11. David F. Wells, *God the Evangelist: How the Holy Spirit Works to Bring Men and Women to Faith* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), p. 67.

flesh")¹² is the antithesis of the Spirit's fruit. The Spirit's fruit (love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control, Gal 5:22-23) is the believer-lover's attestation of growth in spirituality. The Spirit's fruit are both sign and substance of "transformation" to Christ's image, and moral virtues needed in the following of Him. They are marks of genuine spirituality. The Spirit seeks to restore the fellowship broken by sin and to overcome the separation in a bond of love.

Mystery of Iniquity: The Texture of Social Existence¹³

Article Number 12 of the Lausanne Covenant notes that the church is engaged in spiritual warfare with principalities and powers of evil. It is within the framework of the ongoing cosmic conflict between God and Satan, and the restraining power of the Holy Spirit, that any discussion of sin --particularly in its powerful and mysterious (secret) structural or institutional manifestations - must be set.

Social Reality

From the social sciences, particularly the Sociology of Knowledge, we have learned that the institutions and structures of social life are more than the sum of the individuals that make it up.¹⁴ Society is a dialectical phenomenon that is a human product, as well as producer of the human. Social institutions are basically routinized human patterned norms and behaviors for social living (i.e., family, schools, laws, religion, political and social systems). Some institutions (i.e., family, work, the state . . .) may even be categorized as a "given," as God's "orders of creation," "divine orders" or "structures of creation."¹⁵ Thus, they are seen as God's gracious gifts to human beings for social existence and which, as Emil Brunner reminds us, "even if only in a fragmentary and indirect way, God's will meets us."¹⁶

All social structures and institutions "have moral values embedded in them. They can be good or evil."¹⁷ To speak of sinful structures and institutions is to speak of structures and institutions that have become distorted, misguided,

12. Richard Lovelace's words are instructive: "The New Testament designates the total organism of sin by the term *sarx* (flesh), referring to the fallen human personality apart from the renewing influence and control of the Holy Spirit. The flesh is always somewhat mysterious to us, particularly in its effect on our minds and its operation in the redeemed personality. The New Testament constantly describes it as something much deeper than the isolated moments of sin which it generates." *Dynamics of Spiritual Life* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979), pp. 89-90.

13. See, 2 Th 2:7; Cf. "Our struggle with evil must correspond to the geography of evil." Stephen Charles Mott, *Biblical Ethics and Social Change* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 16.

14. See especially, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Anchor Books, 1967); Peter L. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (New York: Anchor Books, 1969).

15. See, Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1937); and Pedro Arana Quiroz, "Ordenes de la creación y responsabilidad cristiana," in C. René Padilla, ed. *Fe cristiana y Latinoamérica hoy* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones Certeza, 1974) pp. 169-184.

16. Brunner, *Op. Cit.*, p. 291.

17. Meehan, *Op. Cit.*, p. 9.

destructive or oppressive.¹⁸ As such they are in need of liberation --by dismantling, reconstruction, transformation, revolution or "exorcism"-- by human and divine power. What is significant to note is that the texture of social existence reveals the presence of institutions and structures that regulate life, that seem to have an objective reality independent of the individual, and thus can become oppressive, sinful or evil. We are all part of this texture of social existence and our spiritual living is impacted by this complex web.¹⁹

Principalities and Powers

The "powers," as they are often noted in current biblical, theological and ethical discussions,²⁰ speak to us that: beyond personal sin and evil, beyond social structures embedded with sinful or evil moral designs, beyond sinful and evil system of values, there exist evil "in the social and political roles of powerful supernatural beings."²¹ The texture of social existence is indeed permeated by "the mystery of iniquity." Yet, we must note with my colleague Stephen C. Mott that "these biblical concepts relate to phenomena which can be sociologically described and they extend rather than nullify personal responsibility in society."²²

Contra Berkhoff and others, Mott posits that these "principalities and powers" are angelic powers, not depersonalized social forces or principles. His careful exegesis of Scripture and pertinent Hellenistic and Jewish apocalyptic literature compels him to "stress this background, not to bring the occult into the understanding of institutional evil, but because it shows the political and social significance of the powers."²³

Our struggle for an authentic and social spirituality must be cognizant that "our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers (*archai*), against the authorities (*exousiai*), against the powers of this dark world (*kosmokratores*)" (Eph 6:12). These are "powers" who rebelled against God, and, as John H. Yoder reminds us, "were part of the good creation of God."²⁴ Their original power and authority over creation included its social and political life. This authority given by God for providential care has resulted in oppression. They are fallen "powers" with

18. See Patrick Kerans, *Sinful Social Structures* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974).

19. For an early and provocative treatment that deals with sinful and evil social structures, see Walter Rauschenbusch's chapters, "The Super-personal forces of Evil" and "The Kingdom of Evil," in his *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), pp. 69-94.

20. See, among others, Hendrikus Berkhoff, *Christ and the Powers* (Scottsdale, PA.: Herald Press, 1962); Jacques Ellul, *The Subversion of Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pu. Co. 1987), pp. 174-190; Stephen C. Mott, *Biblical Ethics and Social Change*, pp. 3-21; Jim Wallis, *Agenda for Biblical People* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), pp. 38-55; Walter Wink, *Naming the Powers: The Language of Powers in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) and *Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); John H. Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pu. Co., 1972), pp. 135-162.

21. Mott, *Op. Cit.*, p. 6.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

24. Yoder, *Op. Cit.*, p. 143. See, Col 1:15-17.

idolatrous-demonic claims. Notwithstanding their fallen condition they "cannot fully escape the providential sovereignty of God. He is still able to use them for good."²⁵ Yoder categorizes the "powers" as religious structures, intellectual structures (-ologies and -isms), moral structures (codes and customs), political structures (the tyrant, the market, the school, the court, race, and nation).²⁶ The ambivalent status of humanity relative to the "powers," and their manifestations in structures, institutions, and other corporate realities is noted by Yoder under two statements: "we cannot live without them . . . we cannot live with them."²⁷ Yoder states that:

There could not be society or history, there could not be man without the existence above him of religious, intellectual, moral and social structures. *We cannot live without them*. These structures are not and never have been a mere sum total of the individuals composing them. The whole is more than the sum of its parts. And this 'more' is an invisible Power, even though we may not be used to speaking of it in personal or angelic terms. But these structures fail to serve man as they should. They do not enable him to live a genuinely free, human, loving life. They have absolutized themselves and they demand from the individual and society an unconditional loyalty. They harm and enslave man. *We cannot live with them*.²⁸

What is most significant to note at this time is that the "powers" have been defeated and carried captive by Christ. "And having disarmed the powers and authorities, he made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them by the cross" (Col 2:15, NIV). The "powers" have been "disarmed" by Christ, we need not absolutize or respond to their idolatrous-demonic claims. This "good news" is part and parcel of our demonstration and proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In concluding this section, it is important to note that:

The existence of an evil order ruled by supernatural beings must either be accepted or rejected on faith, but such reality would not be dissonant with our social experience. Our concern here is not to settle the cosmological question of whether angels and demons should be demythologized but rather to come to terms with social material to which their biblical existence points. . . . The world-order and the evil presence of the powers are never *synonymous* with the concrete forms of social and institutional life. Institutions function both to enslave and to liberate human existence. The powers are always present along with enslavement and death in small or large degree; but their real existence is behind the scenes in a system of hostile values vying for control of the life of the world.²⁹

25. *Ibid.*, p. 144.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 145.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 146.

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 145-146. It is interesting to note that Yoder thinks that traditional theologies have sought to describe and treat this theme under the "orders of creation." He finds them wanting, though, in that they were not able to "affirmed that it is in Christ that these values all find their meaning and coherence," *Ibid.*, pp. 146-147.

29. Mott, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 10,15.

Any and every spirituality to be authentic and relevant must come to terms with personal and social sin and evil. What is most critical for an Evangelical spirituality is to incorporate within its theology and ethics, not to say spirituality, a "deeper" understanding of the "mystery of iniquity." It must realize that sin and evil goes beyond the individual; that we are all enmeshed in a social living that is complex, dynamic and dialectical; and that our spirituality, and the very Gospel that we preach, needs to be as big and ubiquitous as sin and evil.³⁰ We will falter in our spirituality and thus grieve the Spirit if "our struggle with evil" does not "correspond to the geography of evil." We are assured in this struggle that

We are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am convinced that neither death nor life, neither angels nor demons, neither the present nor the future, nor any powers, neither height nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Ro 8: 37-39, NIV).

*Gospel of the Reign of God*³¹

Eschatology forms the central and essential framework of New Testament theology. The "beginning" of the End, the Reign of God, has broken into our world in the person of Jesus. The message of the New Testament is that God's Royal rule is *already* present in Jesus the Messiah, although it awaits final consummation in the *not yet* of the future. In Jesus Christ we have, in the words of George Eldon Ladd, the "fulfillment without consummation," of the Reign of God.³²

The "good-news" of the Reign meant that beyond God's governing through creation and providence his special reign or rule had broken into history. It is important to note that, "the Greek word *basileia*, which is used for *reign* or *kingdom*, means primarily the *act* of reigning rather than the *place* of reigning; thus in most cases it should be translated as *reign*, *rule*, *kingship* or *sovereignty*, rather than its usual English rendering, *kingdom*."³³

Jesus Christ himself both proclaimed and embodied the Reign. John Wimber notes that "This explains the two-fold pattern of Christ's ministry, repeated wherever he went: first *proclamation*, then *demonstration*. First he preached

30. For a provocative and insightful study that integrates theology with the finding of clinical psychology in interpreting certain "non-physical realities," see, Morton Kelsey, *Discernment: A Study in Ecstasy and Evil* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978).

31. See Mat 12:28.

32. George Eldon Ladd, *The Presence of the Future: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pu. Co., 1974), pp. 105-121; Among the many other pertinent works on the Reign of God, see: George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pu. Co., 1983); Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Basileus - Basilikos*, TDNT, Vol. I, pp. 564-593; John Bright, *The Kingdom of God* (Nashville: Abington Press, 1953); Herman Ridderbos, *The Coming of the Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1962); Amos N. Wilder, "Kerygma, Eschatology and Social Ethics," in W.D. Davies and D. Daube, eds., *The Background of New Testament and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1956), pp. 509-536; C. René Padilla, *Misión integral: ensayos sobre el reino y la iglesia* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pu. Co., 1986).

33. Mott, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 82-83.

repentance and the good news of the Kingdom of God. Then he cast out demons, healed the sick, raised the dead --which proved he was the presence of the Kingdom, the Anointed One."³⁴

The reign of God in Jesus is one of the "spiritual power encounters."³⁵ Jesus' life and mission were both inaugurated and empowered by the Holy Spirit. David Wells states, "so it is that Jesus birth, baptism, miracles, teaching, sacrifice, and resurrection are all ascribed to the working of the Holy Spirit."³⁶ Roger Stronstad can thus speak of Jesus' life and mission as that of the Charismatic Christ. He goes on to state that "Jesus is not only anointed by the Spirit, but He is also Spirit-led, Spirit-filled, and Spirit-empowered."³⁷ Jesus' mission is one of the Spirit's anointment for "spiritual power encounters."³⁸

The powers of the age to come have indeed invaded this age. The "signs and wonders" were and still are a witness to this reality. The Reign of God has come because the "strong man's house" has been invaded by the Charismatic Christ (Mt 12:28). C. René Padilla states that:

The kingdom of darkness that pertains to this age has been invaded; the 'strong man' has been disarmed, conquered, and robbed (Mt 12:29; Lk. 11:22) . . . In other words, the historic mission of Jesus can only be understood in connection with the Kingdom of God. His mission here and now is the manifestation of the Kingdom as a present reality in his own person and action, in his preaching of the Gospel and in his works of justice and mercy.³⁹

The Gospel of the Reign of God is the good news that in the life, death and resurrection of Christ. God's reign is manifested in the physical and historical affairs of people --bound and hindered by demonic forces-- now able to experience the Spirit's total liberation.⁴⁰ God's salvation in Christ affects the whole person --both spiritual and physical-- in his/her concrete historical reality. Nothing is exempt from God's reign. While we live in the *not yet* of complete fulfillment of the Reign of God, that awaits the *parousia* in the future, we nevertheless continue to share in Jesus' mission of liberation through *proclamation* and *demonstration* (See: Jn 20:21).

The early church's experience of the baptism of the Spirit (Ac 2) was interpreted as a continuation of Jesus' mission in the power of the Spirit. "Signs and wonders" attested their participation in the *now* but *not yet* of the inbreaking

34. John Wimber, *Power Evangelism* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986), p. 6.

35. See: John Wimber, *Op. Cit.*; Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984); and David F. Wells, "Spiritual Power Encounters" in David Wells, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 65-91.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

37. *Op. Cit.*, p. 45.

38. The Spirit of the Lord is on me; therefore he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor" (Lk 4:18-19, NIV).

39. *Op. Cit.*, p. 182.

40. Mott, *Op. Cit.*, p. 94.

of the reign of God. Joel 2:28, 29, was interpreted as the *end* time promise --"the beginning of the end." The early church saw itself as an eschatological community. The Spirit's outpouring gather in a Royal community, the community of the Spirit.⁴¹ Roger Stronstad states that,

If we have interpreted Luke's Pentecostal narrative correctly, then the gift of the Spirit is not salvation, but it is for witness and service. In other words, with the transfer of the Spirit to the disciples on the day of Pentecost, they became a charismatic community, heirs to the earlier charismatic ministry of Jesus.⁴²

While the church is *not* the Reign of God, yet, as the community of the Spirit --where the Spirit manifests itself in a unique and particular way (Ro 8:23; 1 Cor 6:19; Eph 2:14-18)-- it has the purpose to both reflect and witness to the values of the Reign, by the power of the Spirit to the world. Orlando Costas states it in the following way:

Therefore, the church, which is *not* the Kingdom, is nevertheless its most *visible expression* and its most *faithful interpreter* in our age . . . as the community of believers from all times and places, the church both *embodies* the Kingdom in its life and *witnesses* to its presence and future in its mission.⁴³

The church as the community of the Spirit is also engaged in "spiritual power encounters." It struggles with the forces of sin and death, with the demonic powers-that-be, whether individually or institutionally manifested and whether morally, physically or spiritually expressed. The church can depend on the *Parakletos* to bring the charismatic renewal of the church *in* and *for* the world. "Sings and wonders" are thus legitimate expectations in the Spirit's total liberation. Orlando Costas eloquently states the significance of the cosmic and historic "power encounter" in the following:

The Kingdom is an indication of God's transforming presence in history . . . a symbol of God's transforming power, of his determination to make "all things new" (Rev 21:5). The Kingdom of God stands for a new order of life: the new humanity and the new creation which have become possible through the death and resurrection of Jesus. This new order includes reconciliation with God, neighbor and nature, and, therefore, participation in a new world. It involves freedom from the power of sin and death, and, consequently, the strength to live for God and humanity. It encompasses the hope of a more just and peaceful moral order, and

41. See James W. Jones, *The Spirit and the World* (New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc., 1975), pp. 51-76.

42. Stronstad, *Op. Cit.*, p. 62. He defines the term "charismatic" in a functional and dynamic sense. "By 'charismatic' I mean God's gift of His Spirit to His servants, either individually or collectively, to anoint, empower, or inspire them for divine service," *Ibid.*, p. 13. It is thus devoid of soteriological connotations, emphasizing the prophetic and vocational.

43. Orlando Costas, *The Integrity of Mission: The Inner Life and Outreach of the Church* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), p. 8.

thus it is a call to vital engagement in the historical struggles for justice and peace.⁴⁴

The Challenge to Confront Structural Sin and Evil

The Spirit's power encounter defines the cosmic struggle being waged for God's creation. The tendency of many is to see this struggle too individualistically and not see that spiritual warfare must correspond with the geography of evil --the sinful and evil structures of society. The Evangelical Church must see itself not only as a *locus* for personal liberation, but also as a *locus* for social liberation. We must see that the texture of social living makes no easy distinctions between the personal and the social. The church's mission includes engaging in power encounters with sinful and evil structures.

Our confrontation responds to the nature of the structures themselves. On the one hand, we are aware of their creatureness --they are institutions and structures *by* and *for* humans, although their reality *sui generis*. On the other hand, we are aware of their possible demonic nature-- the "powers." On one level of the struggle, it means that the church must bring to bear, through our witness and labors, the power of the Spirit to break the chains of hate, hostility, and injustice embedded in them by introducing the values of the Reign (i.e., love, justice, fair play) and setting in place a "chain of change"⁴⁵ that immediately (thus, radical change-revolution), or gradually (thus, multiple and cumulative amelioration-reformation) humanizes these structures and institutions. On the other level of the struggle, the church must witness to the demonic powers that lie behind the scene, by reminding them of their defeat in Christ and the coming New Age. This witness must be in the power of the Spirit, armed with the "full armor of God" (Eph 6:10-18). Jim Wallis states it well,

The church demonstrates Christ's victory over the powers by reminding them of their created role as servants, rebuking them in their idolatrous role as rulers, and resisting them in their totalitarian claims and purposes . . . We are not asked to defeat the powers. That is the work of Christ, which he has already done and will continue to do. Our task is to be witnesses and signs of Christ's victory by simply standing firmly in our faith and belief against the seduction and slavery of the powers.⁴⁶

The proclamation of Christ until He comes and its impact on urban society will be predicated on Evangelicals constructing a theology and ethics of the Spirit that is consistent with Scripture, and social reality --a theology of the Spirit that leads to a social spirituality, the missing dimension of Evangelical spirituality.

As an Evangelical pentecostal, I challenge the pentecostal and charismatic churches to go beyond the given theology of the second person of the Trinity, to

44. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

45. See: Mel King, *Chain of Change: Struggles for Black Community Development* (Boston: South End Press, 1981).

46. *Op. Cit.*, pp. 48-49.

develop a full-blown *pneumatology*,⁴⁷ the basis for an authentic and biblical spirituality. Perhaps, this may be our greatest contribution to the church as it approaches the 21st century. *Maranatha!*

Resumen

Utilizando un modelo trinitario para redefinir la espiritualidad social cristiana, a la luz de la realidad urbana moderna, el autor procura establecer las bases bíblico-teológicas para una espiritualidad social evangélica que le preste mayor atención a la obra del Espíritu Santo en la tarea social de la iglesia.

Apunte bibliográfico

Sandoval, Moises *On the Move: A History of the Hispanic Church in the United States* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1990). Paper 152 pp., \$8.95.

Fr. Kenneth Davis

The mature fruit of a veteran of Hispanic Catholic activism and journalism, this book attempts to write Church History from the perspective of the poor and marginalized. Sandoval is editor of *Maryknoll*, is the author of three other books, and is a frequent contributor to such journals as *U.S. Catholic Historian*.

His new work includes timely, trenchant criticism. Amazingly, Sandoval names names: he quite frankly outlines who he feels has helped the cause, and who has not. Praised are Archbishop Patricio Flores, Sr. Gregoria Ortega, Fr. John García, deacon Antonio Sandoval, and Layman Ruben Alfaro. Those criticized include Archbishop Urban J. Vehr, and several Hispanic bishops who are passed over with little mention. Indeed Sandoval concludes this section by saying: "As a group, Hispanic bishops show no greater commitment to Latin America than their Anglo colleagues." He seems willing and able to give in-group criticism. However, the first half of the book tells the tale of the conquest of what used to be northern Mexico, and the subjugation of the Mexican Church by foreign clergy and religious such as Archbishop Jean Lamy. It relates the broken treaties and cultural imperialism which assaulted the soul as much as the troops that seized the land. the criticism of contemporary Hispanic leaders then must be seen in the context of a people who have not been well served by their Church, and whose native clergy is few and often not supported by the hierarchy.

As an eyewitness to much of the contemporary scene, Sandoval assesses such promising movements as the three *Encuentros*, the *Cursillo* movement, Marriage Encounter, *Movimiento Familiar Cristiano*, Basic Christian Communities. He commends the accomplishments of PADRES, HERMANAS, MACC and COPS, but seems to have little positive regard for the regional offices of Hispanic ministry.

The book also includes a chapter on Hispanic Protestantism by Edwin E. Sylvest, Jr., notes, and a helpful index and bibliography.

Because of its brevity, it may have done better to try to cover only contemporary events (such as those which have transpired since Sandoval's 1983 history *Fronteras*). More attention to the story of the non-Mexican descent Hispanic population would have made the book more balanced. Perhaps its chief failing is that it mentions little about recent strides in catechesis and religious education among Catholic Hispanics. While seminaries and Catholic schools have not invited or sustained Hispanic students, catechesis and lay formation institutes are a shining example of what can be done, and therefore deserve to be mentioned.

Despite this omission, the work is a much needed addition to the paucity of studies on this subject, and is a worthy accomplishment by an award-winning author.

47. See: Eldin Villafañe, *Towards An Hispanic American Pentecostal Social Ethic, With Special Reference to North Eastern United States* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: U.M.I., 1989).

Artificial Intelligence, 1992, and Las Casas: The Valladolid Connection

Alejandro García-Rivera

There is a great debate afoot in the Eurocentric academic institutions of the United States. It is a debate as old as the New World with possible dire consequences for its sons and daughters. It is over the question of what it means to be human. The issue, however, was raised by a most inhuman source: A box about 2 feet by 1 foot by 6 inches with a television on top. The computer has engendered a revolution equivalent to Wittenberg's printing press. And like any revolution, it is raising deep and disturbing questions. It is the thesis of this paper, that the present debate whether a computer can think, i.e., exhibit true intelligence, is an echo of the debate at the beginning of the 16th century whether the people of the New World were truly human.

The debate in the sixteenth century climaxed in the famous confrontation in 1550 at Valladolid between Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda and Bartolomé de las Casas. Ginés de Sepúlveda argued:

...if you know the customs and nature of the two peoples [Spaniards and Native Americans], that with perfect right the Spaniards rule over these barbarians of the New World and the adjacent islands, who in wisdom, intelligence, virtue, and humanity are as inferior to the Spaniards as infants to adults and women to men. There is as much difference between them as there is between cruel, wild peoples and the most merciful of peoples, between the most monstrously intemperate peoples and those who are temperate and moderate in their pleasures, that, is to say, between apes and men.¹

Las Casas parried:

whatever I say about the faith of the Indians I have seen with my own eyes, not only in one place or one nation but in very many. They honor the holy sacraments of the Catholic Church and receive them with a great indication of piety. If they cannot be helped by the sacraments because of a lack of priests, these sincere people grow pale, lament, grieve and weep. Again, at the time of death you may see in them a wonderful concern about their salvation and their soul--a clear sign of eternal predestination that is characteristic of Christians.²

1. Translated from *Democrates Alter sive de justis bellis causis apud ludos*, ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, "Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia," No. 21 (Madrid, 1892) and printed in *New Iberian World: A Documentary History of the Discovery and Settlement of Latin America to the Early 17th Century*, Vol. I (New York: Times Books, 1984), pp. 324-5.

2. Originally in *In Defense of the Indians*, translated and annotated by Stafford Poole (De Kalb Northern Illinois University Press, ca. 1974), pp. 55-7, 60-1, 254-5, 349-353 and printed in *ibid.*, p. 330.

The present-day debate, on the other hand, is taking place within the scientific community that is working on what is known as AI, artificial intelligence. These cerebral folks claim that they can model a set of computer instructions in such a way, that if the computer were behind a curtain, we would not be able to tell it apart from a human being. These folks claim that they will eventually come up with a set of computer instructions (known as an "algorithm") which will allow a computer to compute intelligent answers to any questions we might ask. Indeed, they claim, someone who could not see the computer or know that one was behind the curtain would simply assume that they were talking to a regular person.

The above is known as the Turing test. It is a test devised by the father of computing science, Allan Turing, in anticipation of the powerful potential he foresaw for his creation. His test remained a curiosity through the 1940's up until now, when these powerful computers became a near-certain reality.³ The imminence of computers powerful enough to simulate intelligence has suddenly made Turing's test both a claim and a question of profound significance.

John Searle, a philosopher at UCLA Berkeley, became aware of the significance of the claims being made by the AI community and responded with a strong argument against their position. Dr. Searle conjured up an ingenious thought experiment known as the Chinese Room to discredit the validity of Turing's test as a measure of intelligence. By doing so, Dr. Searle has planted himself in the midst of a furious debate that shows no sign of ceasing. What is at stake, in my opinion, is the definition of what it means to be human and who has access to that definition.

The Chinese room thought experiment is as follows: Imagine a room with a curtain. Inside the room are baskets containing the sets of Chinese characters. Also imagine a book correlating one Chinese character with another in such a way that if the Chinese characters that are being looked up make up a question, then the Chinese characters they match make up an answer to that question. The matching of Chinese questions to Chinese answers constitutes an algorithm. This is the type of operation a computer does best. Now, instead of a computer let us put a human being that will receive Chinese characters, look them up in the book, and then pick out the corresponding answers from the baskets. This human being, however, does not speak any Chinese!

Now let us apply our Turing Test. A Chinese person stands outside the curtain, and writes out in Chinese characters, a question. He places the question inside the curtain, where our non-Chinese speaking human being matches the characters in the book and collects the corresponding matches from the baskets. The characters are then given back to the Chinese person outside the curtain, who

3. IBM's chess computer "Deep Thought" ranks among the top 40 chess players, flesh or metal, with a U.S. Chess Federation rating of 2,552. It recently narrowly lost a game to chessmaster Anatoly Karpov (rating of 2,850) in a February 2, 1990 game at the Harvard Campus. *PC Computing*, July 1990, "Endgame," pp. 144-9.

sees an intelligent answer, mutters to himself and walks away convinced that he has communicated intelligently with another human being.

Dr. Searle's point is that although an algorithm was performed, the one who performed it had no understanding of what happened. The non-Chinese speaker inside the curtain cannot read Chinese and as far as he is concerned, no understanding has occurred. The question asked by the Chinese person outside the curtain is but a bunch of meaningless squiggles. Thus, Turing's test fails. The "computer," an intelligent person, unintelligently manipulated meaningless squiggles. The conclusion of the Chinese person outside the curtain is false, since no meaningful action took place behind the curtain! The AI community has responded vigorously against Searle's Chinese Room argument, but there is no doubt that it is a serious challenge to their claim.

I believe that one significant aspect of the debate is the source of the controversy: a challenge to the European mind about the identity of their own humanity. The European intellectual framework for their understanding of humanity can be traced to Henry Maine's *Ancient Law*. Maine postulated that "modern society" (ie. European civilization) has evolved from a society in which the unit was the family to the more "civilized" unit of the individual.⁴ It corresponds, of course, to a culture in which science, technology, and commerce are highly important. It led to subsequent ideas of cultural evolution in which cultures "progress" to a pinnacle of civilization. This pinnacle, of course, is Europe.⁵ Although this view is not seriously held by professional anthropologists⁶ today, it is, nevertheless, widely held in Western thought.⁷ The faith of the EuroAmerican enterprise in its logical framework, its method of framing questions,⁸ has once more led to a question that exposes their lack of understanding about the significance of meaning, for the debate mentioned above with the corresponding Chinese Room argument revolves around the question of meaning, and *not* intelligence!

The identity of our humanity, in my opinion, does not lie in our "intelligence" but in the meaning that we associate with our lives. That meaning is not given to us by some Newtonian machination of technological prowess but by our lives

4. L.L. Langness, *The Study of Culture* (Novato, California: Chandler & Sharp, 1987), p. 29.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

6. Marvin Harris, *Cultural Anthropology*, Chapter 25.

7. Langness, *Op cit.*

8. The well known scientist Arthur R. Jensen is an example, albeit an extreme example, of this centrism. In an article for the *New York Times Magazine*, September 21, 1969, he regards American Negroes inferior to "Orientals" based upon the Stanford-Binet IQ test. Jensen believed that "intelligence is the ability to adapt to civilization" and thus "races differ in this ability according to the civilizations in which they live." This is why the Stanford-Binet IQ test measures the ability to adapt to Western Civilization, p. 14.

together and with our environment in the phenomenon we call culture.⁹ To search for the identity of the category "human" is to search for meaning found only in the "web" of our culture. A machine has no culture although it might someday be intelligent. Intelligence, in a sense, is a cultural judgement. This has been demonstrated time and again in the IQ test differentials between children coming from different cultures. A lack of appreciation for the significance of culture as harbor of meaning is, in my opinion, at the root of the AI debate. This as far as I can see comes from a centrism inherent in the heirs of the European culture to equate universality with the meaning of their culture. Thus a challenge to the web of meaning in their culture is interpreted as a challenge of "universal" proportions, the identity of their own humanity. Thus, I believe, the nature of the controversy stems from confusing "intelligence" as a universal category and not recognizing "intelligence" as a cultural category.

The above analysis seems to me to be transferable to the situation of the great debate of the early 16th century over the discovery (from the European point of view) of the people of the New World. In short,

The sudden irruption of an unknown but numerous portion of mankind into a world organized according to the cosmography of Hellenic antiquity...provoked serious questions. There was no place, literally, for this fourth and new world, come too late into a cosmology inherited from Ptolemy and incorporated into dogma by the Church.¹⁰

Thus a challenge to the web of meaning of European culture provoked disturbing questions. The façade of the universality of the culture's categories was effectively laid bare and the struggles that ensued to deal with the crisis were tragic for the people of the New World. The question whether there is a human being behind the curtain is not that different from the question whether there is a human being behind the Cuban *bohío*. The successful dealing with that question meant recognizing the source of our meaning and that was very difficult for a Europe victorious over many other cultures and obsessed with unifying its brief empire.

The unintelligibility of the Native American Culture by many Europeans was interpreted as a lack of "intelligence." This, I feel, provoked the debate as to the humanity of the Americans. It was, however, not a question of intelligence at all but one of meaning. European centrism prevented many from opening their "web" long enough to allow new meaning to take hold. It is in this respect, that the Native Americans were more "intelligent" than the Europeans. They at least had ample room in their culture to make meaning for these strange creatures of the

9. Clifford Geertz in his writings has influenced my view of culture. One of his definitions from his work: *The Interpretation of Cultures*, is that culture is "a web of meaning."

10. Jacques Lafaye, *Quetzalcóatl and Guadalupe: The Formation of Mexican National Consciousness 1531-1813* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1976), p. 37.

East. In due course, the Native American culture successfully transcended its own centrism and made new meaning through religious experiences such as the Lady of Guadalupe. This openness may be the key to their ultimate survival in a new *mestizaje*. There has been very little room, however, for the same to take place in the European culture. In fact, the European's inability to reflect on the meaning behind their "intelligence" led to the savage oppression and killing of Native American people. The facade of European "purity" may yet prove to be a fatal hybrid in an inability to adapt to the unknown demands of the Third Millennium.

What might be the consequences of our present day debate, then, for the still suffering people of the New World? For one, a new New World is in the making, and it is being constructed in part from a European world view. How the European culture assimilates the Chinese Room challenge into its "web" of meaning will affect all of us who must live with and, in many cases, under them. Perhaps now is the time to bring up the question of culture and meaning and universality within particularity. Perhaps this is an opportunity for the people of the New World to join the debate with the experience of history as perspective. One thing is for sure. The computer will be a center of power in this new New World and access to that power might well prove to be a new source of oppression in the Third Millennium.

Can machines think? Perhaps; yet our humanity is not based on our ability to follow a set of instructions but in our ability to give meaning to those instructions. To those who in the future will want to impose instructions on us, we ought to bring a cultural perspective.

(This paper, by the way, was written on a computer.)

Resumen

Comparando el debate en el siglo XVI sobre la humanidad de los indígenas americanos con el debate del siglo XX sobre la inteligencia artificial, el Rev. Alejandro García-Rivera se pregunta si el debate moderno llevará a una deshumanización de los grupos oprimidos y marginados de este siglo, tal y como ocurrió con los indígenas en el siglo XVI. Para evitar tal consecuencia, será necesario redefinir el concepto de lo "humano" en términos distintos a como lo ha hecho la cultura occidental

Reseña bibliográfica

Luis N. Rivera Pagán, *A la sombra del armagedón* (Editorial Edil: Decanato de Asuntos Académicos, Recinto de Río Piedras, Universidad de Puerto Rico) 1988, 335 páginas.

Pedro A. Sandín Fremaint

La estructura del libro me parece, de entrada, uno de sus valores. Consiste de ocho capítulos, precedidos por un prefacio y seguidos por dos apéndices. El primer apéndice es una cronología que se extiende desde 1938, fecha en que se logra fisiónar por primera vez el núcleo atómico, hasta 1988 que es la fecha en que se termina de escribir el libro. El segundo apéndice es una bibliografía selecta y comentada. Es importante señalar que cada capítulo y cada sección está precedido por intensas ilustraciones, obra de Anaída Pascual, en las cuales vemos terribles escenas nucleares enmarcadas por civilizadas formas: cúpulas, arcos, precisos cuadrados y rectángulos; ilustraciones en las cuales la foto documental, el dibujo y la forma contribuyen, desde mi punto de vista, a subrayar el vínculo estrecho entre el horror nuclear y nuestra civilizada cultura moderna.

El orden de los capítulos sigue una rigurosa lógica que nos permite dividir el libro en dos partes, con el hongo nuclear de Hiroshima y Nagasaki en el mismo centro. Los primeros cuatro capítulos nos llevan desde los orígenes del estado moderno y de la ciencia moderna hasta agosto de 1945. Esta parte se lee con creciente interés y suspenso, en la medida en que nos acercamos implacablemente a los apocalípticos eventos que culminaron la Segunda Guerra Mundial. Sobresale el tercer capítulo, en el cual el autor documenta los fracasados esfuerzos de algunos científicos por evitar el uso de la bomba contra Japón, mientras el lector cruza los dedos como deseando que el lenguaje narrativo se transforme en una nueva oportunidad y que esta vez prevalezca la sensatez.

La segunda parte consiste también de cuatro capítulos. En los primeros dos se describen esencialmente los inútiles intentos de establecer el control internacional de la energía nuclear y el hongo de proliferación nuclear generado por las detonaciones sobre el Japón. Los últimos dos se dedican al análisis crítico de la lógica del armamentismo y a la exploración de alternativas al Armagedón, de senderos inéditos por los cuales se pueda construir la paz. Cada uno de los capítulos está extensamente documentado por numerosas notas en las cuales el autor nos refiere a sus fuentes, a la vez que comparte con nosotros comentarios marginales que enriquecen la obra.

Este libro de Luis N. Rivera Pagán surge, según el mismo autor, "de la aspiración intelectual de entender el origen del sistema militar nuclear y del impulso moral de contribuir a la búsqueda de respuestas al desafío crucial que nos plantea" (p. 11). Se propone, de paso, hacer una contribución al movimiento antinuclear puertorriqueño, "iluminando el origen y desarrollo de la terrible metástasis nuclear" (p. 13). Si una obra debe ser evaluada de acuerdo con los objetivos que se ha propuesto, no cabe duda de que el libro de Rivera Pagán es un éxito. Los capítulos II al VI están repletos de información documentada y analizada, por medio de la cual obtenemos una comprensión casi microscópica de la historia del problema nuclear entre 1938 y 1988. Estos capítulos no sólo nos ayudan a comprender el desarrollo de la bomba atómica y de la subsiguiente proliferación nuclear, sino que también ponen en evidencia ciertas falacias y mitos

popularizados que falsifican la historia. Sobresale, por ejemplo, la manera como el autor demuestra que las bombas de Hiroshima y Nagasaki no eran necesarias para terminar la guerra. Mientras el peligro de una bomba atómica nazi proveyó la justificación inicial del proyecto Manhattan, las razones que mueven a detonar el arma sobre el Japón ya nada tienen que ver con una Alemania rendida ni con un Japón exhausto, sino que responden más bien al deseo de justificar el enorme presupuesto del proyecto y al interés de intimidar a la Unión Soviética. Una de las ironías de esta triste historia es que se haya dado la capacidad teórica y tecnológica de producir la bomba justo en el contexto de un amplio consenso antinazi. Uno no puede evitar preguntarse si ante un adversario de menor envergadura se hubiese podido reunir a tantos científicos y políticos en torno a tan nefasto proyecto.

Pero, en lo que respecta a la dilucidación de las raíces del fenómeno nuclear, mi capítulo preferido es el primero, titulado "Nacionalismo, ciencia y guerra". En este capítulo, Rivera Pagán traza los orígenes del fenómeno nuclear militar a los orígenes mismos de la modernidad: la fragmentación de la cristiandad, el desarrollo de la ciencia y del estado modernos y la teoría de la guerra como la norma de relación entre estados autónomos. Es escalofriante constatar, con Rivera Pagán, la asombrosa continuidad que hay entre las ingenuas consignas de la incipiente ciencia moderna, esa ciencia del *cómo*, supuestamente liberada del dominio del *por qué* y del *para qué*, y las siguientes palabras de Oppenheimer, el padre de la bomba: "Si se es científico se cree que es bueno descubrir cómo funciona el mundo... que es bueno legar a la humanidad el poder mayor posible para controlar el mundo" (p. 24). Pero, el hongo nuclear sobre Hiroshima y Nagasaki, quizás el emblema por antonomasia de la civilización occidental moderna, desmiente a Oppenheimer y la falacia de creer que la ciencia puede operar en un vacío axiológico. Es irónico el abismo entre la capacidad intelectual y la capacidad moral del ser humano moderno. El intelectual termina por sorprenderse al descubrir que lo que creía ser el gesto más humano posible, el nítido ejercicio de la razón y de la experimentación, lo ha conducido a la apoteosis de la más cruda naturaleza. Es la peligrosa paradoja moderna, la misma que nos ha conducido a la crisis ecológica, la paradoja de dominar a la naturaleza desde un estado de naturaleza. El estado moderno se comporta como un organismo complejo y termina por apropiarse de las más sofisticadas inteligencias de sus ciudadanos para ponerlas al servicio de la guerra.

En ánimo de apresurar esta presentación quisiera subrayar algunos de los valores generales de la obra para luego pasar a formular algunas preguntas críticas.

1. La obra logra un buen balance entre la atención a lo que podríamos llamar la macrohistoria y la microhistoria del fenómeno nuclear. Le permite al lector abordar los detalles, digamos, del desarrollo y uso de la bomba de fisión nuclear, sin perderse en dichos detalles, sin perder de vista su contexto amplio. Es decir, los detalles de la producción y uso de estos armamentos, de las polémicas que los han rodeado, se enmarcan dentro de una interpretación de la historia que le imprime una clara cohesión a la obra.

2. La obra es, a mi parecer, una demostración excelente de la importancia del trabajo interdisciplinario. Entran en juego en este libro perspectivas que

pertenecen a la física, la historia, la política, la sociología, la filosofía, etc. Pero ninguna de estas disciplinas es capaz, por sí sola, de abordar y dar cuenta de este tipo de asunto cuya importancia nadie puede negar. Además de rebatir temáticamente la falacia de la neutralidad axiológica, la obra rebate, mediante su propio comportamiento, otro importante error moderno, el de la miopía disciplinaria.

3. Aquí me tomo un riesgo mayor, pero me interesa decir que esta obra pone en evidencia otro error de la modernidad. En la medida en que la ciencia moderna procuró liberarse del control de la teología, la reina de las ciencias medievales, llegó a creerse que operaba en un vacío teológico. Los análisis de Rivera Pagán sobre el lenguaje nuclear, particularmente en el capítulo VII, demuestran sin embargo, que es ese supuesto vacío se va desarrollando una nueva dogmática, una escolástica, una religión nuclear (que es el título de otro ensayo del autor). El misil nuclear termina por convertirse en el más reciente de los ídolos. No sugiero que la ciencia deba supeditarse a la teología, comprendida como cúmulo de dogmas, pero me parece que no está fuera de lugar una seria reflexión sobre este problema. Y si me permiten un anuncio religioso no pagado, para que la presentación también tenga su diez chavos de proselitismo, me parece que cierta teología cristiana radicalmente anti-idolátrica no está del todo despistada.

4. La obra de Rivera Pagán evita caer en el error de creer que el dilema nuclear se da estrictamente a lo largo del eje este/oeste. Llama la atención el autor a la necesidad crítica de atender al problema del Tercer Mundo. Sugiere, podríamos decir que proféticamente, a la luz de los recientes acontecimientos, que el escenario más probable de una tercera guerra mundial no sería una crisis en Europa Central, sino un escalamiento de una crisis en el Tercer Mundo (p. 286). Y añade el autor: "no habría auténtica y permanente paz en el hemisferio norte del planeta hasta que se resuelvan las graves desigualdades sociales, económicas y políticas que aquejan al sureño" (p. 287).

5. Esta obra de Rivera Pagán propone, a mi parecer con gran acierto, la necesidad de forjar lo que él llama un "humanismo universalista" (p. 271). Ante la inaudita capacidad que tienen las armas nucleares de aniquilar la vida en la tierra, al autor propone que se adopte una nueva perspectiva, según la cual el énfasis no se ponga "en la contradicción entre los credos de la disciplina comunista y la libertad individual, sino entre la humanidad y la no humanidad, entre la existencia común y el exterminio común" (p. 271). Sólo si llegamos a concebir el planeta como un sólo organismo podremos escapar de la guerra fraticida y suicida entre unos estados y otros. Curiosamente, es desde la perspectiva apocalíptica del exterminio final que se acentúa nuestra suerte común y nuestra inseparabilidad. A la consigna de algunos norteamericanos de *better dead than red*, es necesario afirmar que no hay tragedia de hoy que merezca el sacrificio de todos nuestros mañanas.

Pasemos a las preguntas, las cuales formulo como materia para futuras discusiones. Advierto, además, que mis preguntas se arraigan en un rasgo de carácter que me distingue del autor. Soy sinceramente pesimista y creo que de todas las doctrinas cristianas la más acertada antropológicamente es la del pecado original. Creo, a la vez, que el mito de Caín y Abel es de un realismo balzaciano.

1. Si bien es cierto que el fenómeno nuclear, tal y como se discute en la obra, pone de manifiesto la necesidad de que la capacidad moral del ser humano se desarrolle a la par con su capacidad intelectual, me pregunto cómo se puede fundar una moralidad, que sea en su universalidad análoga a la ciencia, en un mundo tan fragmentado ideológica y materialmente. Pienso en Enrique Dussel y su ética fundamentada en el encuentro de cara a cara con el otro ser humano. Coincido en que la ética que necesitamos no puede fundarse sino en ese encuentro. Pero, ¿cómo se establece y universaliza esa moral? En última instancia, no estoy seguro de que la discrepancia entre el desarrollo intelectual y moral no se deba a que el primero nos sea dado como posibilidad intrínseca de la especie, mientras que el segundo no nos sea natural.

2. El autor se plantea la pregunta de si era posible o no evitar la construcción y el uso de las armas nucleares. Considera que afirmar la inevitabilidad del fenómeno nuclear militar equivale a negar "la mediación de la voluntad humana ética". Sin embargo, me parece que lo que está en juego no es una cuestión de posibilidad sino de probabilidad. La cadena de coincidencias que contribuyeron a la manufactura de la bomba (amplio consenso anti-nazi, expatriación de numerosos físicos judío-alemanes, etc.) me hace pensar que la decisión de construir la bomba estaba sobredeterminada y bastante lejos del alcance de la "voluntad humana ética", la cual a la luz de las dichas encuestas norteamericanas sigue en franca minoría. Por ejemplo, en la página 312, Rivera Pagán afirma: "De la misma manera que hoy contemplamos con horror las contiendas, en el Imperio Romano entre gladiadores, o las torturas con que la Inquisición española doblegaba a los herejes, asimismo, de no acontecer un holocausto nuclear global, contemplarán los seres humanos del futuro nuestra salvaje inclinación a la guerra". Me interesa identificar el sujeto de ese verbo "contemplamos", porque no estoy seguro de que sea "el ser humano". Estamos rodeados de evidencia que sugiere que a poco regresaríamos el circo romano. Desde las peleas de perros hasta la violencia doméstica, desde el fervor con que se promueve de nuevo la pena de muerte en Estados Unidos hasta los excesos de un ayatola en Irán; desde las páginas del Vocero hasta la pornografía infantil, tantos fenómenos sugieren que el sujeto del verbo sólo comprende a una parte, quizás minoritaria, de la humanidad. Entonces, mi pregunta es si hay aprendizajes morales permanentes, y si no los hay, ¿estamos condenados a imitar a Sísifo?

3. No puede pasar desapercibida la ironía de que esta investigación de varios años, concluida en 1988, salga a la luz en 1989, sin haber podido tomar en cuenta los inauditos sucesos de ese año. Me gustaría saber cómo el autor incorporaría estos sucesos a su análisis.

En resumen, debo decir que, desde mi pesimismo, me regocija el optimismo crítico e inteligente de Luis Rivera Pagán. Sólo desde ese optimismo, acompañado de un profundo compromiso moral, se pueden convocar las energías necesarias para producir una obra de esta envergadura. Se recibe con gratitud porque es obra de generosidad. Permítaseme, pues, para terminar, cederle la palabra al autor. Previendo que habrá quienes tilden de utópicas sus propuestas inéditas, dice: "En realidad, son tan utópicas como la abolición de la esclavitud, la igualdad de los derechos femeninos, la eliminación de la segregación racial, la superación del colonialismo, la erradicación de la viruela. Constituyen, ciertamente, un conjunto

de senderos inéditos. Pero en un momento en que los caminos trillados parecen dirigirse hacia una catástrofe global, surge la preciada oportunidad en la que el idealismo se conjuga con el pragmatismo, la visión utópica con el imperativo histórico. La disyuntiva es clara e inexorable: *seguir a la sombra del armagedón o recorrer los senderos inéditos de la paz*" (p. 314).

Apunte bibliográfico

Kay Brigham, *Cristobal Colón: Su vida y descubrimiento a la luz de sus profecías* (Barcelona, España: Editorial Clie, 1990). 178 pages. Hardcover.

Javier Quiñones-Ortiz

The nearness of the Columbus quinquennial has produced a wealth of literature in which varying ideologies are wrestling for the hearts and minds of all those concerned with this controversial issue. I am certain that, by now, most readers have been exposed to several views about what we as Christian Hispanics ought to do and think in light of this historical event. The book herein reviewed, is one of such attempts at influencing our opinion on this matter.

The author of this work is an Anglo woman who has done considerable work in the Spanish language—evidenced throughout the book, which is eminently readable—and literature. She has some theological training from the Westminster Theological Seminary extension program in Miami, and has published a bilingual study on the Book of Revelation.

Kay Brigham's original, but flawed, work about Christopher Columbus, was written to "Commemorate the Quinquennial of the Discovery of America." In it the author tries to show that the "Bible was the main source of inspiration for the Great Enterprise" of this famed explorer. Therefore, in the opinion of the author, Columbus' *Libro de las profecías* (Book of Prophecies) is essential in order to reconstruct Columbus' self-image, as well as in understanding that the most important influence in his monumental work of exploration, and his sense of purpose and mission in life, was the Christian faith. The Book of Prophecies is "a compilation of passages from the Scriptures which the Admiral thought pertinent to his discovery mission, selected by Columbus himself with the help of his friend brother Gaspar de Gorricio." Since this Book of Prophecies has been largely neglected in the treatment and consideration of Columbus as a historical figure, this work seeks to offer a contribution towards overcoming that neglect.

The book is divided into two parts. First, we are introduced to the man himself. This is by far the best part of the book. It is very well written and in it we find a very succinct tale of

how Columbus came about all his accomplishments, what were some of the significant events throughout his career as "Admiral of the Seas," and some personal matters, just to name a few of the issues touched upon in this section. Once again, let me emphasize that this is a very well written section, despite its clear ideological bent towards a romantic-idealistic portrayal of Columbus.

But this faulty picture of Columbus is not as evident in the first part of the book, as it is in the second part. In this second part, the author engages into a well researched discussion of the theological thought of Columbus as reflected in his Book of Prophecies. More specifically, in the use and role that the scriptures had in the formation of Columbus' sense of mission. As I read this section I was amazed, on one hand, at how important and influential the Bible was for Columbus, and, on the other hand, how naive the author was in the treatment and interpretation of the historical events surrounding the life of this, perhaps, the greatest of all explorers.

This is not by any means a critical reading of the Book of Prophecies of Columbus. It is, rather, a very simplistic, historically and theologically uninformed, romantic-idealistic description and interpretation of the alleged mind of Columbus. The whole enterprise of the so-called discovery is seen only from the perspective of a narrow understanding of the biblical view of the providence of God, and Columbus emerges as the fundamentalist par excellence. One has to ask whether or not Columbus was of as much historical significance in the conquest of the Americas as some of the other figures involved in it, e.g., Pizarro, Bartolomé de las Casas, etc.

In my opinion this book is a good example of the kind of triumphalistic ideology of those who would benefit the most from the preservation of the status quo in our understanding and views on this momentous occasion, i.e., the quinquennial. It is hoped that as 1992 approaches, our understanding and appropriation of the significance of this event for our lives as Christian Hispanics will not be obscured by the dominant ideologies of the left or the right, so that we can better grasp the immense significance of this event. Works like this, however, cannot, in the long run, help much in this matter.